India

FOR THE

No. 58. New Series.
No. 152. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1899.

[Registered as a Newspaper.] {Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 65
Indian Views of Indian Politics ... 68
Five Years' Experience of Closed Mints, by E. H. Pickersgill, M.P. 69
"The American Revolution" 70
Our London Letter 71
Chronicle of the Week... 71
The Calcutta Municipal Bill: Further Protest of Ratepayers (Telegram) 72
Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner on India .. 72
"England's Responsibility for India": Address by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji 73
Indian Affairs in Parliament: Special Report 74
Public Meetings on Indian Questions: The Work of the British Committee 75
Advertisements 76

An Index with Title-page to Vol. IX. of India *(January to June,* 1898) *and an Index with Title-page to Vol. X. (July to December,* 1898) *are ready. Copies will be sent gratis and post free to Subscribers on application to the Manager.*

NOTES AND NEWS.

As we announced last week, the Indian Parliamentary Committee will submit an amendment to the Address with reference to the Calcutta Municipal Bill, as to which we print a further telegram to-day from our Calcutta correspondent. The following amendment, which stands in the name of Mr. Herbert Roberts, M.P. (secretary of the Indian Parliamentary Committee) has been placed upon the Paper :—

Humbly to assure your Majesty that this House regards with grave concern the introduction of the Calcutta Municipal Bill now under consideration by the Bengal Legislative Council, which, if enacted, will practically destroy the representative character of the Calcutta Municipality, and will constitute a retrograde step in the system of local government in India ; and prays that your Majesty will graciously direct that the further consideration of the Bill be postponed until a duly constituted Commission has taken evidence and reported upon the objections urged against the Bill by the ratepayers of Calcutta.

Mr. Robinson Souttar, M.P., will second the amendment, and Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., will be among those who will speak in support of it. A concise leaflet describing the nature of the Bill, and setting forth official testimony to the good work done by the elected commissioners, has been approved by the Indian Parliamentary Committee and circulated to all members of Parliament by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress. The British Committee has also circulated information upon the matter to the Press and to individual members of Parliament, and Mr. N. N. Ghose's pamphlet on the Bill is being widely distributed. Good hopes, we believe, are entertained that this activity will not be wholly fruitless. Indeed it is already rumoured that the Bill is likely to be postponed.

The reference to India in the Queen's Speech was meagre and colourless, and attracted from the ornamental speakers remarks of the same type. The big guns on both sides have preferred to avoid the whole subject. India, indeed, appears to be the only topic in the Speech from the Throne which habitually fails to excite remark from the leading lights of the Opposition. The gilt is well scraped off every other piece of gingerbread in the Speech, but India is left severely alone. Is it that the leaders of the Opposition do not care about India? Or is it rather that they do not know? The normal and proper course would be for the ex-Secretary for India to apply to the conduct of Indian affairs in the debate on the Address the same type of general criticism as that which is applied by other ex-Ministers to matters in their departments. But this of course would pre-suppose an interest in the subject and a certain refusal to swallow at a gulp any official pabulum which the Secretary of State may choose to purvey. On the present occasion, as will be seen from our Parliamentary report, Sir William Wedderburn endeavoured to fill the gap with a speech which surveyed in general terms the salient points of the situation in India. The difficulty of this task, especially when it is thrown upon a private member, is great; and one would naturally expect public opinion, and its organs, to support those who, with so much difficulty, and at the cost of so much odium, try to obtain a hearing for what is practically the unanimous opinion of educated India. But public opinion has not yet slept off the fumes of official anæsthetics, though the patient occasionally gives signs of returning consciousness.

One reads that the Indian Budget this year will be, as compared with its predecessors, a "very satisfactory one." The harvests have been good and the exchange has continued to rise. But it is easy to see from the comments in the *Pioneer* and other Anglo-Indian papers that it is only by comparison that the Budget gives rise to congratulation. A recurrence of famine or war (and on all hands it seems to be agreed that they are bound to recur) would at once disturb the financial equilibrium. On the other hand the expenditure on railways for the future will, it is hoped, be much more moderate than in the past. But there is one bad circumstance in the situation, and that is that the large returns under the head of Land Revenue are to a considerable extent due to the payment of the arrears from the time of famine. This exaction of arrears with its temporary increase of revenue is only too likely to prevent the peasants from gaining by the present prosperity, and to leave them burdened with debt at the mercy of the next period of scarcity. It is an indication of the desperate financial state of India that the *Pioneer* hails this prosperous budget—as an opportunity for carrying out necessary reforms?—no, as an occasion for omitting "the pernicious practice of borrowing in sterling that the Government may pay their way." An unusual combination of favourable circumstances having arisen, we are asked to be thankful that the Government will not have to borrow.

Had the Mad Mullah made a better fight the financial situation would of course have been much worse; and it is poor comfort to be told that the threatened storm "is not likely to gather again at least for several months to come." After the expenditure on the late war beyond the frontier it might have been hoped that peace could be assured for more than several months. Before the war there had been sixteen years of peace. Moreover it is now reported that the Hadda Mullah is once more intriguing among the tribesmen. Finally it has been noticed that the Ghilzais who have visited India this cold weather have been offering for sale Martini rifles which have neither the Government stamp nor that of the Kabul workshops. It is supposed that these come by way of the Persian Gulf, and the Amír, who has no wish to see the great tribes well armed, seems powerless to stop the traffic. In any case the disarmament of the tribes on our North-West frontier seems a task beset with difficulties.

It is still an article of faith in some quarters that the Indian Government always knows better what is good for the Indians than do the Indians themselves. To those who still entertain this view a reading of the *Pioneer's* remarks on the new plague resolution of the Punjab Government may be recommended, a resolution "which amounts to little less than a complete change of policy." Our contemporary continues :—

It is too the more praiseworthy as it has been made at a time when the Province is practically free from infection, and is therefore not open to the criticism that it has been prompted by timidity or fear. We have grown so accustomed during the last few years to the grant in all parts of India of concessions to popular sentiment on and after an outbreak of popular displeasure, that it is quite refreshing to be able to welcome any modifications in the prevailing system of treatment at a time of peace, and the Punjab Government is to be congratulated on the example which it has set.

But as long as the Indian Government believes itself to be always wiser than its subjects, and is encouraged in that belief by so many influential journals both in England and in India, it will always be indisposed to grant concessions,

except under the stimulus of disorder or discontent. In the case of the plague it has been forced by the logic of facts, by the patent failure of measures opposed to the sentiments of the people, reluctantly to admit that it was on the wrong road, and that its critics were right when they said that no measures could succeed unless backed by popular approval.

At bottom the point in dispute was whether the medical should or should not be subordinate to the political aspect of the question. The Punjab Government, with the warm applause of the *Pioneer*, now admits that it should be subordinate, as the leaders of Indian opinion have all along contended. The Government has now decided among other reforms to abandon as both useless and opposed to the sentiments of the people, corpse inspection, prosecutions for concealment of cases, and house to house inspection, with regard to which our contemporary remarks :—

> We are not surprised to learn that it quite failed in its object, whilst we can only stand astonished at the moderation of the Punjabis who submitted to it for so long and so quietly.

To take another point, much of the suspicion which attached to the plague hospitals was due to the belief that European treatment and medicines were forced on the patients against their will, and this belief was fostered by the exclusion of all but one or two friends of each patient from the hospital; for as the *Pioneer* well says :—

> The main underlying principle of our rule in India is absolute and fearless publicity in all things, and if this is to be neglected in our treatment of plague we have only ourselves to thank for the ignorance which we deplore.

"Absolute and fearless publicity in all things." We commend this golden rule to the Secretary of State for India when in the course of the Session it may be his duty to answer questions in the House of Commons. Meanwhile it may be asked why the *Pioneer* has not protested against the breach of this principle in the case of the Natus.

To many Anglo-Indians it seems difficult to decide which is the worse: the impertinence of the Indians in meeting to discuss public affairs, or their seditious absurdity in claiming a greater share in the government. The *Pioneer*, it must be admitted, has sometimes done its best to belittle the Congress; but as usual it puts forth most excellent general principles :—

> We may safely say that there is no Englishman whose opinion is ever likely to count for anything in the settlement of these questions who is not in favour of a policy of liberality and concession to the natives of the country, and who does not hope to see them as time goes on more and more intimately allied and associated with the Government. The question is merely one of time and manner, not of principle; and as such it is eminently one for the exercise of persuasion.

And therefore our contemporary welcomes the publication of the new work, "Indian Politics," which we notice at some length on another page, and which consists of (1) a series of essays on current questions by leaders of the Congress party, (2) the addresses of the Congress presidents, and (3) the Congress resolutions. The *Pioneer*, we are glad to see, welcomes this book; but it may be allowable to remind that journal that "time" does "go on," while very little is done by it or its friends to reduce its excellent principles to practice. As for the Government, as "time goes on" it seems to go back further and further from the *Pioneer's* new ideal.

But the *Pioneer*, while admitting that most of the essays deserve to be considered on their merits, or at least give a good presentation of the aims of the party, falls foul of two, Mr. Aiyar's on Indian Railways, and Mr. Nundy's on Indian Poverty, on the ground that, as they do not suggest definite remedies, their only object can be to throw mud at the Government. Now surely to insist that no wrong should ever be exposed without a remedy being suggested at the same time is a counsel of perfection. But in this case it is unnecessary to enquire whether this rule must always be followed. Mr. Aiyar's argument seems to be strictly defensive. It is argued as a reason for making railways that they will diminish famine, and therefore no expense must be spared in pursuit of so holy an object, and he replies that the poverty, which is increased by reckless expenditure, renders the people unable to purchase grain at a price high enough to pay for the carriage. This may or may not be true, but surely if it is true the practical application is obvious—not to pull up existing railways, which the *Pioneer* is willing to allow would be an object justifying the paper, but to ensure a more prudent expenditure on railways in the future than there has been in the past. As to Mr. Nundy's paper, the *Pioneer* admits that in the sense that India contains "a larger number of poverty-stricken beings India is getting poorer every day." But how can our contemporary object to Mr. Nundy putting forward his views on this interesting question, when it has itself lately opened its columns to a discussion on the same subject?

But the same objection to railways that Mr. Aiyar urges is put forward by the *Hindu*, which shares the natural preference for irrigation which Sir Arthur Cotton, who has done such great things, always shows. The argument which appears so ridiculous to the *Pioneer*, that railways produce no food, but only transport it from one district to another, is being constantly urged by the irrigationists. But perhaps that is allowable in the advocates of a rival scheme which is indefensible in those who do battle for moderation in expenditure. On two points in regard to irrigation there seems to be a good case, one that railway schemes secure more praise in official minutes and excite more notice in England than those for irrigation, and therefore are unduly favoured, and the other that, as Sir Arthur Cotton wishes, an investigation should be made as to the extent to which irrigation is possible. Sir Arthur bears high testimony to the character of the Indian people :—

> After forty years of work among the people of India, the impression remaining in my mind is that they are a thoroughly manageable people certainly inferior to no other race in intelligence and sound sense. During all my intercourse with them, in carrying out past engineering works, I always found them a docile people, as long as they were met with ordinary justice and consideration.

Whatever their detractors may say, the fault of their poverty is not in them.

Among the blessings of English rule in India none can compete in magnitude with the salt-tax. According to the official returns for Madras quoted by the *Hindu*, the cost of the manufacture of salt is 3 annas per maund. The retail price varies from 3 rupees 1 anna 2 pice to 4 rupees, at which latter price the tax is considerably over 2,000 per cent. on the cost. At the beginning of the century the price was only 9 annas 4 pies, or about one-sixth of what it is now. But this is not all. It has always been found that high duties result in attempts to evade the law, but it is no light matter to find that in the Province of Madras alone 17,700 salt cases were reported and 9,449 persons were dealt with by the Courts. The Government, following the bad old methods which were tried against smugglers in Europe, clamour for heavier penalties, drawing the attention of district magistrates to the importance of inflicting really deterrent punishments, which in any other country but India would be thought a dangerous interference with the independent exercise of the powers vested in the judiciary.

The Indian craves justice as well as sympathy. Thus, the *Bengalee* is struck with Lord Curzon's utterly matter-of-course expression about "holding the scales even." It says :—

> He promises in unequivocal terms to "hold the scales evenly" between the conflicting interests of the different races who have passed under his sway, and we cannot be sufficiently grateful to him for this public declaration of his future policy; and if his performance in this respect is in consonance with his promise, he will assuredly endear himself to the people he has come to govern. Let him deal with each question as it comes up for decision in the above spirit, and with an impartiality "that refuses to be irritated by criticism or cajoled by flattery" (to quote the words of one of his predecessors), and he will attain a position in the great roll of the Rulers of India second to none of his illustrious predecessors.

Just so. The Indian is not in the least the perverse person he is so often painted. He is anxious to find reason to applaud his governors. He yearns for the timely word and act of good human feeling. He is the most easily governed subject under the sun, if his rulers would only condescend to be moderately considerate and humane.

The grievous oppression, disorganisation, and loss resulting from the anti-Indian crusade in South Africa are exhibited in lurid colours by the petition of Mahomed Cassim Camrooden & Co. and others, addressed to the Colonial Secretary, and dated Durban, December 31, 1898,

The petition deals only with one point—the operation of the Dealers' Licences Act in Natal, against which the petitioners protested, though unsuccessfully, in 1897. Indians cannot trade without trade licences. When an Indian wants a licence at Durban, he must apply to the Licensing Officer of the Town Council, who subjects him to an abominably inquisitive examination as to his pecuniary position, his stock, capital, and private affairs generally. "He has made it a rule," the petitioners state, "not to grant a trading licence to any Indian who has not before held such a licence in Durban, whether the applicant has held a licence elsewhere in the colony or not, whether he is an old resident or a new arrival, whether he is an accomplished gentleman knowing English or an ordinary trader, and whether the premises in respect of which the licence is sought are suitable in every respect and have been before licenced or not." If the Indian appeals to the Town Council, that body supports its own officer. If the Indian appeals to the Supreme Court of Natal, the Privy Council decide that there is no such appeal from the Town Council under the Dealers' Licences Act. The Indians, therefore, lie at the mercy of the prejudice of the Town Council, and the Town Council has no mercy. Has Mr. Chamberlain "Imperial" spirit enough to put a summary end to this disgusting oppression of our Indian "fellow-subjects" in a British colony?

Consider the position of the petitioners. They place their trust in the gracious Proclamation of 1858, in which her Majesty declared:—

> We hold ourselves bound to the Natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects, and those obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil.

Is this solemn declaration to be turned to a falsehood in her Majesty's mouth? The petitioners imagine not; and they are encouraged in their difficult belief by an assurance from Downing Street with reference to previous memorials, namely:—

> It is the desire of her Majesty's Government that the Queen's Indian subjects should be treated upon a footing of equality with all her Majesty's other subjects.

Let this "desire," then, be manifested in acts, otherwise let it be withdrawn from the sight of honourable men. Again, hear the petitioners:—

> All over the world, whenever necessary, Indian soldiers have been fighting the battles of Great Britain, and Indian labourers have been opening up fresh fields for colonisation. Only the other day a Reuter's cablegram stated that Indian soldiers would be requisitioned to train up the natives in Rhodesia. Can it be that the fellow-countrymen of these soldiers and labourers are not to be allowed to earn an honest living in a portion of her Majesty's dominions

Let Mr. Chamberlain answer that appeal. Everybody knows that the Colony of Natal owes its prosperity—nay, its very existence at this day—to the thankless work of Indian labourers. And yet the white colonists are now engaged in a deliberate and organised attempt not simply to deny to the Indian traders the right of earning an honest living in a useful way, but even to deprive them of such right, a right they have enjoyed in past years when they were setting the colony on its legs. It is too monstrous.

Let us look at an example. Take the case of Somnath Maharaj, who, early last year, applied for a licence to carry on a retail trade in the borough of Durban. The licensing officer, that creature of the Town Council, examined him up and down and could find nothing against him. The sanitary inspector had examined the premises, just vacated by an Indian storekeeper, and failed to find any fault whatever. Yet the licensing officer refused a licence! Somnath appealed to the Town Council. Observe what happened:—

> It was proved that the applicant had served the colony for five years under indenture; had been resident in the colony for thirteen years as a free Indian; had by dint of perseverance raised himself to the position of a trader; had held a license on Mooi River in the colony over six years; had a cash capital of £50; held a piece of freehold land in the borough; had his dwelling-house separate and some distance from the intended store; and had engaged the services of a European bookkeeper to satisfy the requirements of the law. Three well-known European merchants certified as to his respectability and honest dealings. He was to trade in a locality mostly inhabited by Indians, and his custom was to be entirely Indian. Counsel for the applicant asked for the licensing officer's reasons for refusal, as well as a copy of the record of the application. Both these applications were rejected, and the licensing officer's decision was upheld by the Town Council.

There is no need for comment. The British public will at once understand from the simple narrative how far such a body accepts Mr. Asquith's notion of "effective association" with the Natal Indians "in their task of working out for themselves a higher and a better political and social ideal."

It must be added to the credit of the Supreme Court that judges quashed the proceedings of the Town Council on appeal, declaring the action of the Town Council "oppressive" and a "disgrace" to them. The appeal, however, did not go to the whole application, but only to the irregularities of procedure. So the Town Council reheard the case, furnished a copy of the record, and called upon the licensing officer to state his reasons. "The applicant," said that worthy, "has no claim whatever upon Durban, as the class of trade he is engaged in is sufficiently provided for in the town and borough." His decision was upheld, so the store stands vacant, and Somnath is eating up his hard-won capital. A remark of Sir Walter Wragg, the acting Chief Justice, on the appointment of the licensing officer by the Town Council, is well worth notice:—

> It has been suggested to the Court that an officer so appointed must have a certain amount of bias in his mind, because he was an officer permanently under the Town Council, and must be in the Council's confidence. His lordship was not going to decide the matter on that point; but he could quite see that the licensing officer should be some person who was not in the Town Council service, and who was not in the confidence of the Council.

But let us carry the plight of these Indians a step further. Take the case of Osman Dada. Listen to the reasons why the licensing officer refused his application:—

> The Act of 1897, as I understand, was passed with a view of placing some check on the issue of trading licenses to certain classes of people, generally regarded as "undesirables." And as I believe I am right in assuming that the applicant in question is one that would be included in that class, and moreover as he has never before had a licence in Durban, I have felt it my duty to refuse his license.

But if Osman Dada "never before had a licence in Durban," he had traded for fifteen years in the Colony; and this is his character on the evidence of Mr. Alexander McWilliam, "one of the principal merchants of Durban."

> I have known the applicant for a great number of years—twelve or fourteen years. I have dealt very largely with the applicant. He has owed me at times as much as £500. My dealings with him have been perfectly satisfactory. I have found him to be a very good business man and respectable. I have always been able to take his word for anything he says . . . As a ratepayer I should have no objection to his getting a licence.

In the Council, a notorious fire-eater moved that the licensing officer's decision be confirmed. No one seconded. Then a noteworthy thing happened. A seconder appeared, and this is what he said:—

> He was not surprised that there was a great deal of reluctance on the part of the Council to refuse the license. But he believed that the license would be refused, and the reason was *not because the applicant or the premises were unsuitable* BUT BECAUSE THE APPLICANT WAS AN INDIAN. . . . . Parliament, representing the community of Natal, had come to the conclusion that it was undesirable that the Indians should increase their hold on the trade of Durban. And it was on that account that they (the Council) were practically called upon to refuse the licences, *which were not otherwise objectionable.* Personally he considered the refusal of the licence a grievance to the applicant, *who was a most suitable person* to appear before the Council to ask for a license.

And so he seconded the ignoble motion—naked and unashamed. There is no more to be said but this: Natal is in this matter a disgrace to the British name.

The issue is clear. The small men thus "weeded out" will go to the workhouse—if there be a workhouse (for Indians)—or die of starvation. Where can they go? What can they do? This will bring down the biggest Indian houses in the colony. "Messrs. Mahomed Cassim Camroodeen and Co., the first signatories hereto, for instance, have outstanding debts among nearly 400 Indian storekeepers and hawkers in Natal to the extent of over £25,000, and own landed property in Durban tenanted by Indian storekeepers." Well, obviously, they are doomed. And so with the rest. "Every storekeeper is in a state of feverish anxiety. The suspense is dreadful." How could it be otherwise? The thing is infamous beyond expression. And we glory in our "Imperialism"!

INDIAN VIEWS OF INDIAN POLITICS.

It is with special pleasure that we welcome the appearance of a most useful and timely volume on "Indian Politics," just published by Messrs. G. A. Natesan and Co., Madras. It consists of (1) a series of eleven original articles discussing from the Indian point of view a number of the more important questions now engaging the attention of the country; (2) the addresses delivered by the first thirteen Presidents of the Indian National Congress, in full; and (3) the full text of the resolutions passed by the first thirteen Congresses. It would have involved but inappreciable delay to include the presidential address and the resolutions of the Fourteenth Congress, held in December last. We trust that the volume will find a large circulation in the British Islands, so as to bring compendiously and authoritatively before the people at home some of the substantial contentions now urged on behalf of our fellow-subjects in India and in other parts of the British Empire. We say "some" of the substantial contentions, for we do not find any article that professes to treat with adequate fulness the obnoxious sedition laws, the paralysing Press restrictions and Press Committees, the unfortunate personal relations of Anglo-Indians and Indians, and other points that bear materially upon the contentment and prosperity of the country. But no doubt these omissions have been deliberately made, in virtue of the invincible self-restraint and consideration of Indian politeness. Indeed, throughout there is no trace of recrimination; the writers address themselves, impersonally, to pure fact and argument. The leaders of Indian opinion fully recognise and make ample allowance for the lamentable apathy of the British public on questions that come home to the businesses and bosoms of Indians. "Their own multitudinous affairs at home," as Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee says, "are enough to engross the attention of the most energetic amongst them." Yet, as he also says, "the principles on which the administration is to be carried on," if not the details of fact, "are surely deserving of attention on the part of those who may be said to be the ultimate court of appeal in relation to India and her Government." This is the least that is to be expected from "an Imperial nation like the British."

There is a special propriety in the fact that the "Introduction" is furnished by the pen of Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, the first (and eighth) President of the Indian National Congress. Mr. Bonnerjee boldly and justly claims that "the Congress stands before the world as one of the marvellous successes of British rule in India." It would be a very perverse and cross-grained spirit that could peruse these addresses and resolutions, to say nothing of the essays, without cordially subscribing to the opinion. There is no other source now left open to Englishmen whence they can possibly draw such a quantity and variety of information on the very things they need most to know. Most people will no doubt be somewhat surprised to learn from Mr. Bonnerjee's Introduction that the origin of the Congress in its working form is to be traced to an ex-Viceroy, Lord Dufferin. The first germ of the notion, indeed, developed activity in the brain of Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., who may fairly be called the "Father of the Congress." Mr. Hume's first idea was to bring together annually the leading Indian politicians for the discussion of social—and not political—matters, under the presidency of the Governor of the Province where the meeting was held; the final object being the promotion of greater cordiality between the official classes and the non-official Indian politicians. He discussed the matter with Lord Dufferin very soon after Lord Dufferin had assumed the Viceroyalty. Lord Dufferin, having turned the thing over, suggested that the better plan would be for the Indians to act by themselves: "it would be very desirable," as Mr. Bonnerjee expresses his Lordship's view, "in the interests as well of the rulers as of the ruled, that Indian politicians should meet yearly and point out to the Government in what respects the administration was defective, and how it could be improved; and he (Lord Dufferin) added that an assembly such as he proposed should not be presided over by the local Governor, for in his presence the people might not like to speak out their minds." The results have been brilliantly successful, thanks to the level-headedness of the leading spirits in the management. We are glad that this interesting history is at last made public; and we shall be curious to observe whether it will do anything to soften the vituperation of officials and of the thick-and-thin supporters of officialism.

Mr. Bonnerjee is peculiarly well fitted to speak for his educated countrymen on the grievous charge of seditious purposes—"which, in plain language, means" that they "desire the overthrow of British rule in India." "No charge," he roundly says, "can be more absolutely devoid of foundation than this."

> The educated Indian, like his uneducated countrymen, of the present generation has known no government of his country except the British Government; he has learnt from his studies what the condition of his country was before this Government was firmly established in the land; he sees daily the improvements that have been made and are being made in the condition of his country; he experiences daily the great benefits which British rule has conferred on her; he himself is the product of that benign policy which introduced Western education into his country; he has everything to lose and nothing to gain by the overthrow of the present Government.

If the detractors of the educated Indians would satisfy themselves as to Mr. Bonnerjee's statements and ponder their plain significance, they would inevitably be ashamed to repeat the preposterous charge. Probably also they would feel uneasy till the new laws based upon the odious and foolish charge were expunged from the Statute-book, which they disgrace. Mr. Bonnerjee properly draws attention to the pecuniary sacrifices made by the supporters of the Congress—sacrifices whose extent can be appreciated only by those "who know how straitened the circumstances of the bulk of these classes are." But these sacrifices—and Mr. Bonnerjee might have mentioned others—they bear cheerfully, for "they have a firm faith in the love of justice and fair play on the part of the British public, and they know that, when once that public begin to pay heed to the affairs of India, their position as citizens of the British Empire will be improved, and with this improvement will come many other blessings of British rule which have hitherto been withheld from them." "Indeed," as Mr. Bonnerjee points out, and as all men not blinded by prejudice know, "the principle on which the Indian National Congress is based is that British rule shall be permanent and abiding in India, and that, given this axiom, it is the duty of educated Indians to endeavour to the best of their power to help their rulers so to govern the country as to improve her material prosperity and make the people of all classes and communities happy and prosperous and contented as subjects of the British Empire." This volume will show plainly how steadily and fruitfully the Congress has worked on the lines sketched by Mr. Bonnerjee.

Mr. Eardley Norton leads off the essayists with an able historical review of "the Indian National Congress," which may be recommended for diligent perusal at home. Mr. Norton has been behind the scenes, and he is as stout an Englishman as any opponent of the Congress, but he says this: "If I were asked to single out of their many characteristics that which I considered was the most predominant trait of the men who meet annually to consider the political and other wants of their countrymen, I should be disposed to say it is their sense of pride in being subjects of Great Britain." "We have taught the people to think," he says; "can we now arrest the results of thought?" That penetrating question has to be answered in act and deed. Rao Bahadur R. N. Mudholkar examines the much controverted question of "The Economic Condition of the People of India," and his conclusion is in these noteworthy terms:—

> India has an extensive and expanding trade with all the quarters of the globe, but it is carried on for the most part by foreign capital, with foreign labour, in foreign ships, and the children of the soil have very little share in it. The trade itself is by the excess of exports over imports indicative of a heavy and increasing annual drain which is exhausting the resources of the country. By the dislocation and partial collapse of the old industrial system, from a manufacturing country she has become an agricultural one. Thrown on this one industry, the pressure of the population on land has increased beyond healthy limits, and agriculture itself has ceased to be a profitable occupation. The result is "an acute, widespread, growing poverty all over the country, increasing severe distress among the lower classes and absence of economic staying power in the masses."

With this essay should be read Mr. Alfred Nundy's elaborate article on "The Poverty of India," which is in entire consonance with it. Connected also with the same

set of matters is "The Permanent Settlement Question," which is treated with discrimination and point by Mr. John Adam. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji discusses "The Currency Question," and Mr. Romesh C. Dutt temperately sets forth "Indian Aspirations under British Rule." Mr. P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyar writes on "Lines of Legislation"; Mr. Sorab Pestonji N. Wadia on "The Jury System"; and Mr. V. Krishnaswami Aiyar on "The Administration of Justice"—all of them indicating points of weakness and desirable reforms. Mr. G. P. Pillai examines "The Status of Indians Abroad," and Mr. G. Subramania Aiyar deals with "Railways." We again commend the volume earnestly to all friends of India in this country, whether they see eye to eye with ourselves or not.

FIVE YEARS' EXPERIENCE OF CLOSED MINTS.[1]

By E. H. Pickersgill, M.P.

THE Blue-book named at the foot of this article, which was published at the end of last week, possesses special interest and importance in view of the enquiry now purporting to be made by the Indian Currency Committee. We have now the recorded experience of five years since the closing of the Indian mints. If it is true, as Mr. Ralli stated to the Currency Committee, that "the Indian Government is indifferent to all considerations other than that of raising the rate of exchange to 16d." then the authorities are perhaps entitled to congratulate themselves upon the result of their experiment. We have, however, to consider at what cost to the general interests of the country this result has been obtained, and for this purpose the Blue-book now before me is very useful.

In the first place, while there is a marked rise in the exchange value of the rupee, the fluctuations in this value continue to be very great. It may be worth while to set out in the following table the rates in Calcutta for bank bills on demand for the last three years:—

	Highest.	Lowest.	Difference per cent.
1895-6	$14\frac{13}{16}$d.	$13\frac{3}{32}$d.	11·6
1896-7	$15\frac{21}{32}$d.	$13\frac{25}{32}$d.	11·97
1897-8	$16\frac{1}{16}$d.	$14\frac{9}{32}$d.	11·09

Hence it is clear that the closing of the mints has not produced the effect of lessening the variation of the rate of exchange, and the "pious opinion" of a high-placed official that "we should reach a steady exchange long before the end of five years" has certainly not been realised.

Secondly, to the rise in the exchange value of the rupee must be attributed, at least in part, the general fall in the prices of all the important staples (except grain), which was a very marked feature in last year's export trade. Thirdly, this Blue-book frankly admits the disastrous effect upon trade of the high bank rate. "Trade," we are told, "was seriously hampered by the extreme stringency of the money market in the busy season": the most marked depression being noted in the great staples of cotton, opium, and indigo. Now, this is a very important and significant admission; for Mr. O'Conor, the Director-General of Statistics to the Government of India, stated to the Currency Committee that the restriction of trade was due to the famine and the plague; and he denied, although he was much pressed on the point, that this restriction was in the slightest degree attributable to the closing of the Mints. But, as Mr. Raphael showed to the Committee, a continuous stringency in the money market is essential to effect the object of the Government. The scheme of the Government is that of continually squeezing the money market for the purpose of maintaining the rate of exchange at 16d., regardless of the fact that this stringency of money is a terrible tax on the trade and industries of the country. The contraction of the currency did not, of course, make itself very markedly felt immediately upon the closing of the mints; but the effect has been gradually developed, and it was severely felt during the year 1897-8. On page 66 of the Blue-book we are told that "gold, mostly sovereigns, valued at Rx. 255,400, was tendered at the Reserve Treasuries in exchange for rupees." And this brings me to the remarkable feature of the year under review, namely, the exceedingly large imports both of gold and silver, especially when the circumstances of the country are taken into consideration. In former times of famine a marked incident was the flow of gold *from* India. But in 1897-8 the net imports of gold into India amounted to 730,000 ounces, of the value of Rx. 4,900,000. The coined gold alone amounted in value to Rx. 2,619,517, and part of this was used as a means of remittance. The quantity of silver imported was still more extraordinary. It amounted (net) to more than 44,000,000 ounces, and the value was nearly Rx. 8,500,000. Now, what was the destination of this vast quantity of silver? The amount coined in the Protected States was, according to the returns, less than usual, accounting for only 7 per cent. of the net imports. It is true that there was a large increase in the mintage of British dollars for export to the Straits and Hong Kong. But this fact is quite inadequate to account for an increase from an average of net imports of silver of 6 crores 14 lakhs for the previous three years to 8 crores 47 lakhs in 1897-8. The official explanation is that the extra imports were due to speculative purchases. But Mr. Lindsay suggested to the Currency Committee that the silver was largely used for illicit coinage, stimulated of course by the enormous discrepancy between the intrinsic and the inflated value of the rupee.

The advocates of a gold standard for India often point to the preponderance of foreign trade with gold-standard countries as a strong argument in their favour. It may be well, therefore, to note that, while the trade with gold-standard countries was 81·7 per cent. of the whole trade in 1896-7, the proportion fell in the following year to 76·4 per cent. But I do not attach much weight to the argument, as it seems to me that the interests of the Indian home trade, which are vastly greater than the foreign trade, should be the paramount consideration.

One of the most noticeable features in the import trade of the year 1897-8 was the enormous increase in the importations of sugar. The quantity imported ($4\frac{1}{2}$ million cwt.) was 61 per cent. greater than in the previous year. This was mainly due to the market being flooded with bounty-fed beet sugar from Austria-Hungary and Germany. These countries have been forced to find an outlet for their sugar in the markets of the East by reason of the closing of the United States market by the Dingley tariff, which imposed a countervailing duty equal to the export bounty, coupled with the competition of France in the English market due to an enhanced export bounty on French sugar. These facts give point to the intelligence which has just reached England by telegram that Sir Antony MacDonnell in his recent address to the Northern India Chamber of Commerce at Cawnpore expressed an opinion in favour of the imposition of countervailing duties on bounty-fed sugar. Some years ago the policy of levying duties on cotton goods imported into India was pressed and carried, in spite of the strong opposition of Lancashire. But if the Indian Government should now propose a system of countervailing duties on bounty-fed sugar, instead of meeting with opposition in this country, they would probably receive from some quarters a considerable measure of support, actuated by the hope, not altogether disinterested, that the Indian precedent if established might be followed here.

Amid the general depression which the Blue-book records, it is gratifying to note some slight evidences of the development of Indian industries. Thus the jute manufacturers were active; there was a considerable increase in the exports of teak timber, and a remarkable expansion of the trade in gunny cloth. Further, we are told that "the decline in the imports of paper may be partly attributed to the competition of the Indian paper mills." But the trade which shows the most rapid expansion is that in coal. In 1892-3 the exports were less than 16,000 tons, whereas last year they had increased to 213,000 tons. Bengal coal is used extensively in other Provinces in place of foreign coal. But one regrets to learn that "this trade is somewhat hampered by the insufficiency of railway transport from the coalfields to the sea-board."

[1] "Review of the Trade of British India for the five years 1893-4 to 1897-8. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of her Majesty."

"THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION."[1]

SIR GEORGE TREVELYAN'S "American Revolution" is a book for which it is easy to foresee a great and deserved popularity, a book full of large and generous ideas set off by a charming style and an unfailing wit. He is always delightful whether he is telling with kindly charity the early follies of Charles James Fox, or describing the matchless qualities of George Washington as he makes his first appearance on the great stage of the world's history—whether his theme is the corruption and sycophancy of the King's friends, or the idyllic happiness of life in the Colonies before they entered on the contest which was to mould their destiny. The villain of the piece is of course George III, that model of all the domestic virtues, who for meanness, malignity, and unscrupulousness has rarely been surpassed in the whole range of history. But though it is impossible to deny the public immorality of the King and his supporters, there seem to be two points on which they have been judged somewhat harshly. It is not certain that their policy of taxing the colonies was unjustifiable; and it is probable that a separation was inevitable even if this question had never been raised. As to taxation, the Empire had just emerged from a long, a glorious, but a costly war, from which America had gained an immense advantage. For centuries there had been a continuous trend in national finance towards fixed and general sources of revenue in place of occasional and voluntary ones: and it was therefore only natural that a prudent, enlightened, but unimaginative financier like George Grenville should seek to draw from the American Colonies a definite contribution to the imperial budget. That imperial protection was to be given in return for chance votes of a warship or a subsidy, passed in a moment of enthusiasm which might not recur for years, did not seem to him a fair arrangement or one likely to be permanent. As to the great cry of "no taxation without representation," the Opposition was fairly staggered when it was reminded that Manchester had to pay taxes though no member for Manchester sat in the House; nor was it possible to deny that the greater part of the Empire was even more completely unrepresented. Even at this day for a majority of the inhabitants of the Empire, the three hundred millions of India and many besides, the phrase "no taxation without representation" is a mockery.

Thus the Government had a better case than Whigs and historians have been willing to allow; but the Americans had a still better case than the Opposition had the courage to affirm. The question of taxation was but the occasion on which the serious differences in character and tendencies, in wishes and in needs, between the mother-country and her colonies decisively showed themselves. As Sir George Trevelyan says:—

> But in order to comprehend a policy which lay so far outside the known and ordinary limits of human infatuation, it must never be forgotten that there was a deeper and a more impassable gulf than the Atlantic between the colonists and their rulers. If Cabinet Ministers at home had known the Americans better, they would only have loved them less.

It was this impassable gulf of manners, thoughts and feelings which rendered the separation almost inevitable. Straightforward simplicity, the liberty of a new country, the equality bred of equal conditions of life could not have been kept in harmony with the personal government of a self-willed king, the corruption of the ruling classes, and the subserviency of the mass of the people, without an amount of submissiveness in the one or of discretion in the other which was foreign to their qualities and their position. Nor will everyone agree with Sir George Trevelyan that the separation was an evil. That the contest left behind it some turbulence in America and much distrust between the combatants is doubtless true; nor can it be denied that the middle classes who half a century later attained so great a share in the government of this country were more in touch with American civilisation than the boon companions of Lord Sandwich or the political valets of the King. Yet there is something to be said on the other side. No inference can be drawn from the freedom of Canada and Australia, for it was the revolt of New England that changed for ever the relation of the Mother-country to her colonies. It was that revolt that gave the great impetus to the reformers of Europe, that precipitated the revolution in France, and eventually after many vicissitudes brought about the reform of the British Parliament. Above all it was that revolt and the events that followed it which led to the maxims of liberty passing into the common political language of the most civilised countries of Europe. Nor has it been altogether a disadvantage that the two nations sprung from the old civilisation of England and rivalling each other in material wealth, in perseverance, and in sublime reliance on their own good intentions, should have been prevented by mutual distrust from joining to exploit the nations for the nations' good. If the Northern Republic has stood for three generations as a sentinel guarding the independence of the weaker Republics of America, if now when the temptation of empire is before her she hesitates to assume the part of the virtuous oppressor, it is before all things due to the great principles which were instilled into her by the cannon and the muskets of George III, and which are enshrined in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

There is another point to be remembered, and that is that had the rebellion been postponed the work would have been much more arduous. If as a consequence the colonists had been defeated, progress would have been set back perhaps for generations. If they had been victorious, it would only have been after a struggle compared with which the whole series of events between Lexington and Yorktown would have seemed insignificant. Even as it was, Fox wrote:—

> What a melancholy consideration for all thinking men that no people, animated by what principle soever, can make a successful resistance to military discipline! . . . . The introduction of great standing armies into Europe has then made all mankind irrevocably slaves!

He was especially depressed by "the sad figure which *men* made against *soldiers*." But the changes which have taken place since: the improvement of transport, the invention of new and expensive fire-arms, even the purification of public life by which the efficiency of the public services has been so much increased, have tended to make the lot of rebels more and more desperate. The fowling-pieces of the colonists were not by any means useless against Tower muskets, but what civil population could stand against Dum-dum bullets and Maxims? Once Sir George in another matter forgets the very necessary distinctions brought by the effluxion of time and the progress of civilisation. He says:—

> The connexion between war and politics, in the aristocratic England of four generations ago, was not less close than in the great days of ancient Rome.

This is altogether misleading. The triumphant generals of the Roman Republic did not return to play a secondary part in the State. It was long since the leaders of an English army had been the chiefs of the English Government. If in this respect England had been like ancient Rome, Chatham would have charged at Minden and North have stormed the heights at Quebec, and Fox and Pitt would have struggled for the command of legions as well as for offices of State.

Of all the causes which promoted the separation of England and America, not one was more potent—though it had nothing to do with tea or taxation, being of a much more necessary and permanent character—than the ignorance of the colonies displayed by the Government, forced as it always is in such a case to rely on the information of officials often out of touch with those whom they have to rule. It would indeed be an exaggerated view to class the present rulers of the provinces of the Empire with those who looked on the colonies only as "a larger field on which to fatten a herd of worthless parasites." But Indians might possibly be able to find some modern representatives of General Gage, whom Sir George describes as "one of those mischievous public servants who know a colony so much better than the colonists know it themselves." Nor is Franklin's view of the part sometimes played by governors and lieutenant-governors only true of the West and of the last century. Something not unlike it might possibly be found in the East at a much nearer date. Franklin wrote:—

> Their office makes them insolent; their insolence makes them odious; and, being conscious that they are hated, they become malicious. Their malice urges them to continued abuse of the inhabitants in their letters to administration, representing them as disaffected and rebellious, and (to encourage the use of severity) as weak, divided, timid, and cowardly. Government believes all;

[1] "The American Revolution." Part I, 1766-1776. By the Right Hon. Sir George Otto Trevelyan, Bart. Longmans, Green, and Co., London, New York, and Bombay. 1899.

thinks it necessary to support and countenance its officers. Their quarrelling with the people is deemed a mark and consequence of their fidelity. They are therefore more highly rewarded, and this makes their conduct still more insolent and provoking.

There is another difficulty still afflicting the Empire which troubled it more than a century ago. In this loose collection of distant provinces, with various antecedents and conflicting interests, it is a hard task to avoid sacrificing the welfare of one part to the wishes of another. A hundred and twenty-five years ago the Government sought to relieve the finances of the East India Company by facilitating the export of their tea to Boston and thereby set going a series of events which led to results so tremendous. At present the rights of the Indians are sacrificed to the narrow jealousies of Australia and Natal. To-morrow some new injustice or piece of favouritism may illustrate the annals of our glorious Empire.

One other lesson may be drawn from the history of the crisis. There is no small likeness between the present moment and the first years of the American struggle when the satirist could say, "For, know, poor Opposition wants a head"; nor can it be doubted that the errors of that miserable time were much promoted by the supine and divided counsels of those who sat on the left of the Speaker's chair. But it is noteworthy that, when by the genius and matchless devotion of Charles James Fox that period of impotence passed away, he did not gain his great position by pandering to the prejudices of the day, by making a profession of patriotic moderation, nor by offering to the country either a pale or an exaggerated imitation of the policy of the Government. He fought for the principles of liberty and justice; he defied the cant of patriotism and the tyranny of "the majority"; and in the end the country rallied to his views, and his opponents fell—objects of distrust to their contemporaries and of scorn to their posterity.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

(FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.)

PARLIAMENT reopened its doors on February 7, after a long and eventful recess, and once more the fickleness of politics is illustrated. Only a few weeks ago Liberalism appeared to have reached a lower ebb than ever, and Tory orators great and small went about the country saying with derision—where is the Opposition? Yet I have scarcely ever known the Liberal party to be in better spirits, to be more full of hopefulness and fight than they are to-day. There was a meeting at the Reform Club on February 6 to choose a leader for the party in the House of Commons, as Sir William Harcourt had resigned the position. It was known that Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman would be chosen, and chosen unanimously; but what was not known was that he would inspire his followers to the utmost point of enthusiasm. Yet that is what he did. Meetings are often a weariness to the flesh, and of no practical good, but that Reform Club gathering is I think destined to become memorable. Its influence could be seen on the following day when the House met, for the Liberals were going about in a state bordering on exultation, and altogether in a condition of cheeriness remarkable when one remembers that they have still to face a majority of 130 or 140.

Of course the interest in Tuesday's proceedings was to some extent lessened by the absence of Sir William Harcourt, but I think he did well to be away. He is too high-minded a man to wish to embarrass his successor, and had he been in the House some sort of rival demonstration would have almost inevitably taken place when he and Sir Henry came in. Mr. John Morley was there, entering quietly and unnoticed in a crowd, and he sat at the extreme end of the front Opposition bench, being separated only by the narrow gap of the gangway from the genial Mr. Labouchere. Both front benches were very full and indeed the whole House had the appearance of being crammed.

Such were the surroundings when at about ten minutes past four Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman came in. He had a rousing, almost a tempestuous reception, made all the more remarkable by the fact that but three minutes before Mr. Balfour had entered and had been accorded but a tame applause. The whole day may be summed up as a Campbell-Bannerman triumph. He is an extremely popular man not only with his own political friends, but with the whole House, and I noticed that not a few Tories cheered him whenever they could do so with any semblance of party decency. His speech on the Address was an overwhelming success. He spoke for an hour and never once did the interest, or energy, or humour flag. There was nothing forced about it, and yet it was forcible throughout.

I am writing fully on this topic for more than one reason. To begin with I have a little private pride—call it conceit if you like—in connexion with this matter, for when Campbell-Bannerman's name was first mentioned as leader there were those who said: "Oh, he's too easy going; he's too rich and comfortable to do anything; he neither gives nor takes offence," and so on. I stuck to it that Campbell-Bannerman was a fighting politician and only wanted an opportunity to come out strong. I am naturally glad to find I was right. That however is a trifle. What is of real importance is that he showed true grit in connexion with foreign politics. What could be more admirable than his assertion that such ill-feeling as might exist between England and France was not caused by the peoples, nor the Governments, nor the Parliaments; but was caused "by a comparatively small number of vulgar men who carry so-called patriotism to the furthest extreme of folly." When Sir Henry added that masters of language had attempted to define these creatures and had failed, there was a laugh in which Mr. John Morley, recollecting certain recent passages with Mr. Chamberlain, joined. And when Sir Henry went on, "but we know them when we see them; their voices are familiar," somehow everyone instinctively glanced at Sir Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett's seat; but though he had been there just before he was unfortunately absent at the psychological moment.

Again, Sir Henry was equally sound on the Sudan. He declined altogether to be dazzled by mere military success. Military success, he said, did not end the volume, it merely closed a chapter. The question now arises how are we to deal with the Sudan? Can we trust it entirely to Moslem troops? If not the very serious question arises, how are we to provide British troops? The new leader did not care a straw for the impatient shouts of the Tories in this connexion, and he taught them, or attempted to teach them a useful lesson by enlarging on the pains of digestion after repletion. It is all very well to gorge oneself with empire, but the digestion may be a very painful experience after the debauch. In these foreign references, and also those about Crete and China, I recognised the right ring. Sir Henry has evidently a deep and abiding contempt for the braying Jingo, and I should say that he will be sounder than some of his colleagues have sometimes been on Indian affairs. I cannot imagine him coquetting with such a poor creature as Lord George Hamilton amid Tory cheers.

And he was equally good on home affairs, questions of the utmost interest and importance to those who live in London, but which can scarcely be supposed to absorb the attention of those who live in a distant land. Altogether I believe it will be found that the Liberal party has taken a new departure on February 7, 1899. I may be optimistic, but it is my firm opinion that we are on the "up-grade," and when I say "we" I mean Liberals of the right sort. It is foolish and futile to ignore the fact that there are a few "Liberals" of the wrong sort who wish to out-jingo the Tories, so as to capture the voter. To begin with they would never win with that card, but even if they were sure of victory I for one would never join them in any such dirty and immoral campaign. I should not have alluded to them had it not been for the fact that Sir Henry's speech showed he had no particle of sympathy with their pranks which they call principles. This means much, for in this revival of Liberalism under an inspiring leader, all the subject races under our own rule will infallibly benefit, just as will the humble villagers and artisans at home.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, February 2.—Sir Henry Fowler, speaking at a dinner-party in London, asked what responsible Liberal had ever indicated sympathy, much less competition, with those politicians who believed it to be our duty to take everything we could get, to fight everybody, and to make every quarrel a dispute? Every Liberal ex-Minister who had spoken in public during the recent crisis had used words of caution and of warning against provocation or irritation. He held that the Opposition leaders had rendered a very great public service at the time of the Fashoda crisis; it was owing to their patriotic action that France became convinced that this country was in earnest, and abandoned pretensions which were unjustifiable and useless. Need it be added that Sir H. Fowler's speech attracted the approving notice of the *Times*?

At a conference of Australian Premiers held in Melbourne an agreement was arrived at on the subject of federation which was regarded as promising a settlement of this long-debated question. Mr. Reid, the Premier of New South Wales, undertook heartily to urge the acceptance of the Federation Bill by New South Wales, and to make the question a vital part of the Ministerial policy.

FRIDAY, February 3.—Mr. Gerald Balfour, addressing his constituents in Central Leeds, said that the country was with Lord Salisbury in his conduct of foreign affairs, and that both political parties were now committed to a policy of Imperialism. He should not be surprised if the Irish Local Government Act should prove the starting-point of a new period in Irish history. The recent elections under the Act had been conducted with

tranquillity. He did not share the view that the working of the Act would result in a weakening of the Union.

SATURDAY, February 4.—Sir William Harcourt, accompanied by Lady Harcourt, left London for the Riviera.

Speaking at Hexham, Sir Edward Grey said the outlook was now peaceful. There were the possibilities of trouble in Turkey and in China; but there were four things which, he thought, made for peace—the Tsar's manifesto, from the indirect results of which he hoped much, the improved spirit in the discussions between ourselves and the French, the diminished keenness in the competition for annexation in Africa, and the fact that other nations besides ourselves were beginning to lean towards the policy of the open door.

SUNDAY, February 5.—The Filipinos attacked the American positions at Manila last night, and the fighting continued till nine o'clock this morning. The Americans were successful in repulsing the insurgents, on whom they inflicted a loss described as heavy. Their own loss was 20 killed and 120 wounded. The warships took part in the action. The latest telegram stated that General Otis had the situation well in hand.

MONDAY, February 6.—A meeting of members of the Liberal party in the House of Commons to consider the future conduct of public business on the retirement of Sir William Harcourt, was held in the Reform Club. Sir Wilfrid Lawson was called to the chair. Mr. John Ellis moved a resolution warmly recognising Sir William Harcourt's pre-eminent services, deeply regretting his decision to retire from the leadership of the party in the House of Commons, and rejoicing to know that the work of the party would continue to receive his co-operation. Mr. James Stuart seconded the motion. Mr. Atherley-Jones proposed the addition to the resolution of an expression of continued confidence in Sir William Harcourt, which was seconded by Mr. Scott; and with this addition the resolution was unanimously carried. Sir Joseph Pease moved that Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman be requested to undertake the leadership of the party in the House of Commons. Mr. Channing seconded the motion, which was supported by Dr. Farquharson, Mr. A. Thomas, and Mr. Labouchere. The resolution was unanimously agreed to, and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, in intimating his compliance, expressed his warm sense of the great honour done him, his loyalty not only to the party but to the House of Commons, and his hope that they would be able during the Session to give to the Government that which they were so constantly complaining that they lacked—a vigorous Opposition.

The Senate in Washington, after rejecting a motion amending the peace treaty with Spain, ratified the treaty by 57 votes to 27—a majority of three votes beyond the necessary two-thirds. The attack of the Filipinos on Manila was said to have secured two doubtful votes.

TUESDAY, February 7.—The fifth Session of the fourteenth Parliament of her Majesty the Queen was opened by Royal Commission. Our Parliamentary Correspondent describe elsewhere the opening debate.

WEDNESDAY, February 8.—In the House of Commons the Debate on the Address was continued. Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett moved (and withdrew) an amendment concerning the Government's policy in China, and Mr. Samuel Smith moved an amendment concerning lawlessness in the Church of England.

There was more fighting between the Americans and Filipinos near Manila on Tuesday evening. The American forces penetrated into the town of Caloocan, which was also shelled by the gun-boats. General Otis afterwards recalled the troops.

In the Chamber of Deputies, M. Renault-Morlière, reporter of the committee on the Procedure Bill, presented his report, which was accompanied by 127 printed pages of documents. The discussion of the report was fixed for Friday. M. Renault-Morlière, in reply to questions, stated that the enquiries of the committee had elicited nothing whatever of a nature to justify the proposal of the Government Bill. An altogether exaggerated importance had been attached to the reports of underlings, and the evidence of all the witnesses had been tinged with overweening susceptibility. Investigation had proved the entire innocence of the judges of the Criminal Chamber of the charges of partiality made against them. If he were compelled to speak of M. Quesnay de Beaurepaire, added M. Renault-Morlière, he would not seek to qualify what he thought of the attitude taken up by that personage.

THURSDAY, February 9.—A Central News telegram was despatched from Bombay this morning as follows:—"The informer, Dravid, and his brother, who were to have given evidence to-morrow against the prisoners Balkrishnu and Chapekar, in connexion with the Jubilee murders at Poona, were shot last night. Their condition is said to be hopeless. No arrests have yet been reported. The tragic incident has caused a great sensation." It remains to be seen whether any attempt will be made to assign political significance to this dastardly and deplorable outrage. But, if any attempt of the kind should be made, it will be pertinent to ask whether the policy of fierce repression lately adopted in India under orders from home is calculated to discourage secret crimes.

THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL BILL.

FURTHER MEETING OF RATEPAYERS.

"THE PRACTICAL EXTERMINATION OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT."

[BY CABLE, FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.]

CALCUTTA, February 7.

A further meeting, convened by Sir Romesh Mitter, late officiating Chief Justice of Bengal, and others, to protest against the Calcutta Municipal Bill was held at Bhawanipur, Calcutta, on Sunday.

Dr. Rash Behari Ghose, C.I.E., late member of the Viceregal Council, presided.

Leading ratepayers remarked that no reason had been shown for practically exterminating local self-government in Calcutta, and apprehended a hard and troublous time from the proposed all-powerful irresponsible Executive.

A memorial protesting against the principle and certain details of the Bill was adopted.

We refer elsewhere to the steps which are being taken by the Indian Parliamentary Committee to obtain a discussion upon the Calcutta Municipal Bill in the course of the debate on the Address in the House of Commons.

MRS. BRADLAUGH BONNER ON INDIA.

On February 1, at a crowded meeting of the "Bond of Union among Workers for the Common Good," held at 115, Ebury Street, W.C., Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner (writes a correspondent) gave an address upon India. She said that our shortcomings in regard to India covered too wide a field to be dealt with in a single afternoon, so she would confine herself to one or two points and try to make those as clear as possible. Mrs. Bonner first referred to the Indian National Congress, its objects and the manner in which it is misrepresented by the Anglo-Indian and the English Press. She instanced the cursory way in which the recent Congress was disposed of by the *Times*, and said from what the *Times* called the "paucity of grievances," set forth at the December Congress, she would select one or two to lay before the Bond. Mrs. Bonner took first the resolution condemning the continued detention of the Sirdars Natu; and after giving a brief history of the case, so little known to the English public, she said: "If the case of the Sirdars Natu had been the sole grievance set forth at the Congress I should regard it as sufficient to overwhelm us with shame. This warrant of the Viceroy is but the Anglo-Indian equivalent of last century's French *lettre-de-cachet*. The Sirdar Natu is the present-day Indian Dreyfus. In one respect the case of these brothers is worse than that of Dreyfus, for the Natus have never been allowed even the form of a trial—they were punished without any crime whatever being formally alleged. It may be quite right that they should be punished; I hold no brief for the Natus, but in common with every honest man and woman I do hold a brief for Justice; and I say that the English nation ought not to know an easy moment until these men are put upon their trial, and until this monstrous ordinance which puts such despotic, such terrible power into the hands of an English Viceroy be erased from the regulations for our government of India." Mrs. Bonner then proceeded to speak of the Sedition Laws and the Press Committees. "Except in the case of the Mutiny, which was a rebellion of a peculiar character," she said, "we had no reason to look upon the Indians as a specially rebellious people." She then spoke of the insertion in the Code of section 124A and explained that until the disastrous murders of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst this clause was purely ornamental. Then arrest after arrest was made, and the trials usually resulted in a verdict of "guilty" being pronounced by the judge, sometimes even in the teeth of a verdict of "not guilty" pronounced by the assessors; as for example in the case of Keshalkar and Harmolker. Mrs. Bonner spoke with indignation of Mr. Justice Strachey's interpretation of the section, an interpretation upheld on appeal to the Privy Council of England. "Now," she went on, "not only have we this special reading of sedition for India—a reading which if applied to England at the present day would involve putting on trial all Liberals, Radicals, Social Democrats, and the vast multitude who are lacking in affection for our Government of the hour—not only have we this, but a new law for the suppression of sedition has been drawn up in England and imposed upon the Indian people." Having shown how much more oppressive the new law was than the old, Mrs. Bonner spoke of the horrible system of espionage established by the new Press Committees. Apart from the ethical question she thought the Government was taking a very blind and foolish course. If people have grievances, real or imaginary, they will talk of them; if they are not allowed to speak openly and freely they will whisper in secret. It is not in human nature, certainly not in Indian human nature, with its copious gift of language, to efface itself in silence. Speak people must, and the British Government is taking a terrible responsibility in closing all the natural avenues of speech. Mrs. Bonner then

turned to the condemnation passed by Congress on the continual military expeditions, pointing out that these territorial encroachments were in direct contravention of the terms of the Queen's proclamation of 1858, and led to a financial burden which the people of India were quite unable to endure. In proof of that she described the frightful and increasing impoverishment of the agricultural population, and said that the fact that the two admittedly worst famines of the century had occurred so recently as 1877 and 1897 ought to make us institute the most searching enquiries as to whether our methods of government had contributed in the smallest degree to this unhappy condition of things. In conclusion Mrs. Bonner said that although she had by no means exhausted the grievances set forth at the Congress, yet she hoped she had said enough to prove that the *Times* description was an unworthy misrepresentation. It is not by oppression and misrepresentation, she urged, that we shall make India loyal; we can only bind her to us by sympathy and common interests—boundless sympathy which shall teach us to understand Indian thought and Indian feeling. This would not only, as Sir Francis Maclean had said, put down sedition, but it would evoke a responsive sympathy where now there must be too often fear and aversion.

The meeting was a great success, and Mrs. Bonner's admirable address made a deep impression upon her audience.

"ENGLAND'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR INDIA."

ADDRESS BY MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

[From Our Own Reporter.]

On Monday last, at a meeting held at Holloway Hall in connexion with the North London Liberal and Radical Association, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, ex-M.P. for Central Finsbury, gave an address on "England's Responsibility for India." Mr. H. G. Chancellor presided, and there was a good attendance of members.

Dr. D. J. Chowry-Muthu proposed: "That this meeting expresses its cordial sympathy with the constitutional efforts of the Indian people to obtain redress of their grievances and with their desire to obtain the recognition of the elective principle in the government of India; and that this meeting condemns the present attempt to deprive the City of Calcutta of even the partial self-government hitherto enjoyed, and protests against the suppression of a free Press and free speech and other repressive measures." In submitting the resolution the mover said he was very sorry indeed to notice how little interest the people of this country took in Indian affairs, notwithstanding the fact that India was said to form a jewel in the British Empire. Her prosperity meant England's prosperity; she was the best possible customer for British manufactures, and the Indian people had no desire whatever to upset England's rule. But it was unfortunate that the administrative methods adopted by the rulers were such as to weaken the British Empire in the East; a policy of repression and coercion unworthy of a great government had been adopted, and he had to appeal to the English people to insist on the substitution for it of the policy of trust in the people. (Cheers.)

Mr. Wiles seconded the resolution.

Mr. Naoroji, who was received with loud cheers, began with an expression of thanks to the members for having elected him a vice-president of their Association. Passing on to the subject of his address, he said the title was a comprehensive one, and his object was to impress upon them what England's responsibility was. He fully admitted that India had derived a great deal of good from her connexion with England, and for that they entertained the highest and deepest gratitude. But on the other hand they could not forget that the connexion between Great Britain and India began under unfortunate and deplorable circumstances, and the original evil had continued right down to the present day. A further misfortune was that the British people were utterly apathetic and did not understand their responsibility towards India, the affairs of which were represented to them in an entirely misleading manner, so as to make them think they were fulfilling their obligations, whereas a disclosure of the real facts would certainly shame them into endeavouring to redress India's wrongs. He would illustrate this point. The present Secretary of State for India (Lord George Hamilton), speaking in the House of Commons in February, 1895, on the subject of the Indian cotton duties, and claiming to speak with authority on Indian matters because of the official positions he had held in connexion with India, said: "There was no point of resemblance between India and a self-governing colony. Self-governing colonies were self-supporting and self-maintaining. The Government of India was neither the one nor the other, and only lived on the moral and material support which it derived from England. If they deprived the Indian Government of the financial and military assistance it derived from England, it would fall into a state of inanition and collapse. England had paid a heavy tax, both in blood and in money, for having set up that Government. She had to maintain a military establishment enormously in excess of what would otherwise be required. She had to keep 60,000 or 70,000 young English soldiers in India, and the difference between the death-rate which occurred amongst them, and amongst those quartered in this country, was some indication of the price in blood she had to pay. He did not contend that England should make a selfish use of her rights; but at the same time, inasmuch as the Government of India was supported and maintained by England, the Government should take care that India did not set up a fiscal system hostile to vast interests in this country, and which could not be tolerated in this country." That was a statement by a man professing to be acquainted with Indian affairs, and he ventured to describe it as wholly untrue. (Hear, hear.) It was asserted that England had spent her blood and money in the formation and maintenance of the Indian Empire; but he would venture to point out that in all the wars and battles which had contributed towards the building up of that empire, at least three-fourths of the troops engaged were Indian, and it was their blood mainly that was spilt. Again all the expense had been borne by India and not a farthing had been contributed by the English Exchequer. On the contrary England had drawn thousands of millions sterling from India's wealth; and yet in governing her they gave her no compensation for it. But the Indian people were grateful for the introduction of education which had taught them what were their political rights. They were always told that they were British subjects, and yet they were treated as helots. ("Shame.") They were now, however, learning what their rights were and what were the responsibilities of England towards them. (Hear, hear.) The consequence was that they were thoroughly loyal, and they desired the continuance of the British connexion in the hope that they would eventually obtain that political status which the people of England enjoyed. (Hear, hear.) England had set up that great educational force, and why could not statesmen turn it to good account and utilise it on the side of British rule in India? What attitude had Lord George Hamilton taken up in regard to it? Unfortunately in the many speeches which he had recently delivered he had been denouncing it, and the consequence was that they were turning against themselves the very force they had created and were running a risk of converting the Natives into rebels instead of friends. What had the Government done in Calcutta? That city for a period of 22 years had enjoyed a certain amount of representative self-government, under which every possible effort had been made to improve the sanitation of the place. But suddenly a certain Lieutenant-Governor discovered that the state of affairs was unsatisfactory, and the result was that Calcutta was to be deprived of its self-governing powers, and a new law of sedition was being enforced which was creating intense dissatisfaction. What were the relations between England and India to which he specially wished to call their attention? In the middle of the last century, when they first obtained territorial power in Northern India, Bengal, and Behar, their servants were most oppressive, corrupt, and rapacious. These were not his words; they were to be found in letters of the court of directors, to governor-generals of that time. He would read a few extracts. In one letter the court of directors wrote:—"Your deliberations on the inland trade have laid open to us a scene of most cruel oppression; the poor of the country, who used always to deal in salt, betel nut, and tobacco are now deprived of their daily bread by the trade of the Europeans." Lord Clive wrote (April 17, 1765): "The confusion we behold, what does it arise from? Rapacity and luxury, the unwarrantable desire of many to acquire in an instant what only a few can or ought to possess." Another letter of Lord Clive to the court of directors said (September 30, 1765): "It is no wonder that the lust of riches should readily embrace the proferred means of its gratification or that the instruments of your power should avail themselves of their authority, and proceed even to extortion in those cases where simple corruption could not keep pace with their rapacity. Examples of this sort, set by superiors, could not fail of being followed, in a proportionate degree, by inferiors; the evil was contagious, and spread among the civil and military down to the writer, the ensign, and the free merchant." He would read one more extract from a letter of the court of directors (May 17, 1766): "We must add that we think the vast fortunes acquired in the inland trade have been obtained by a scene of the most tyrannic and oppressive conduct that ever was known in any age or country." Such unfortunately was the beginning of the connexion between England and India. These matters would never have come out had it not been for a secret committee of enquiry appointed by the House of Commons in 1772. When the British public realised what was taking place it naturally decided that such things should not be allowed to continue, and consequently in 1833, when the East India charter was renewed, an Act was passed in which a certain clause was introduced with the consent of the leading statesmen of that day with a view of giving to the Natives such an interest in the affairs of their own country as would educate them in self-government, and by securing the affections and good-will of the people strengthen the connexion between England and India. (Hear, hear.) In that clause it was distinctly laid down that, in the service of the Government, there should be no distinction whatever made on account of race, class, or creed. (Hear, hear.) Naturally the Indians were perfectly satisfied with that clause, for under it they expected to be treated exactly like other British citizens. That too was the ambition of the statesmen of those days, and he could not do better than quote the following eloquent words uttered by Macaulay on the occasion of the passing of the Act: "There is, however, one part of the Bill on which, after what has recently passed elsewhere, I feel myself irresistibly impelled to say a few words. I allude to that wise, that benevolent, that noble clause that no native of our Indian empire shall, by reason of his colour, his descent, or his religion, be incapable of holding office. At the risk of being called by that nickname which is regarded as the most opprobrious of all nicknames by men of selfish hearts and contracted minds—at the risk of being called a philosopher— I must say that, to the last day of my life, I shall be proud of having been one of those who assisted in the framing of the Bill which contains that clause." And Macaulay ended his speech in this peroration: "The destinies of our Indian empire are covered with thick darkness. It is difficult to form any conjecture as to the fate reserved for a state which resembles no other in history, and which forms by itself a separate class of political phenomena. The laws which regulate its growth and its decay are still unknown to us. It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown that system; that by good government we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better government; that having become instructed in European knowledge, they may, in some future age, demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not. But never will I attempt to avert or retard it. Whenever it comes, it will be the proudest day in English history. To have found a great people sunk in the lowest depths of slavery and

superstition, to have so ruled them as to have made them desirous and capable of all the privileges of citizens would indeed be a title to glory all our own. The sceptre may pass away from us. Unforeseen accidents may derange our most profound schemes of policy. Victory may be inconstant to our arms, but there are triumphs which are followed by no reverses. There is an empire exempt from all natural causes of decay. Those triumphs are the pacific triumphs of reason over barbarism; that empire is the imperishable empire of our arts and our morals, our literature, and our law." These aspirations of Macaulay and other statesmen had not, however, been realised, and the policy then laid down of "Be just and fear not" appeared to have been abandoned by Lord George Hamilton to-day and to have had substituted for it one of "Fear and be unjust." Unfortunately the Act of 1833 had remained a dead letter. Not the slightest attempt was made to give effect to that for 20 years. In 1853 the Indian service was thrown open to the people of this country by public examination, and then Bright, Stanley and others tried hard to induce the Government to allow Natives to compete for these appointments, but Anglo-Indian opposition proved an insuperable barrier. Then came the Mutiny, which was the fault of the Government, and next the great Proclamation of 1858, which reiterated in the strongest possible terms the promises of the Act of 1833. Let him read to them the remarkable words of the Proclamation: "We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects, and those obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil. And it is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified, by their education, ability and integrity duly to discharge. In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward. And may the God of all power grant to us, and to those in authority under us, strength to carry out these our wishes for the good of our people." Forty years had passed and still the Proclamation was a dead letter. ("Shame.") The promises made had not been fulfilled, and he appealed to the people of the United Kingdom to wake up and do their duty. That was one of the responsibilities he wished to impress upon them. Certainly in 1870 an effort was made to throw open the Civil Service to Indians, but dodges and subterfuges were resorted to in order to defeat the attempt, and instead of the appointment of Indians by competitive examination as in England, they were by nomination, and the best men were not by any means chosen. As to the financial effects of British rule in India he could only say that India was by it made the poorest country in the world. Lord Salisbury had honestly and candidly told them that "India must be bled," and had said it was "political hypocrisy" to talk about the promises that had been made. But were the people of England satisfied that those promises should be ignored; would they not rather see India really an integral part of the British Empire and her people treated exactly like other British citizens? Surely the adoption of any other policy was suicidal, for a loyal India meant prosperity to British trade. Let them, in the interests of honour and justice, abandon the pernicious and evil principles which now marked British rule in India and give effect to those higher aspirations which were entertained by Macaulay and other statesmen and which were embodied in the Act of 1833 and the Proclamation of 1858. (Loud cheers.)

The resolution was carried unanimously and Mr. Naoroji was heartily thanked for his interesting address.

Imperial Parliament.

Tuesday, February 7.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH AND INDIA.

The Lord Chancellor read her Majesty's gracious Speech on the opening of the Parliamentary Session. The Speech made the following reference to India:—

In parts of my Indian Empire I grieve to say the plague still continues, and though it has diminished in some districts previously affected, it has spread to fresh places in Southern and Northern India. Unremitting efforts continue to be made to relieve sufferers from the disease, to check its spread in India, and to prevent its transmission to other lands.

I am glad to be able to inform you that the harvests of the past year have been abundant, and that the trade and revenue of the country have recovered with a rapidity and completeness that has surpassed all expectation.

THE DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.
THE TRANS-FRONTIER WAR, AND LORD ELGIN'S "SUCCESS."

The Duke of Bedford, moving the Address in reply, said in the course of his speech:—Two campaigns had followed quickly upon one another. Both had been successful, reflecting the greatest credit upon all concerned. (Cheers.) He would not attempt to compare those two campaigns from the point of view of military science. In the Indian frontier war the policy which dictated it was very imperfectly understood in this country and consequently the popular enthusiasm was but little aroused. When they remembered that the campaign was conducted under the most trying conditions of climate and country, and against enemies who for more than two months scarcely allowed a single hour, day or night, to pass without keeping some portion of their forces under a murderous fire, he thought their lordships would recognise that the soldiers of the British and Indian armies responded nobly to severer trials than fell to the lot of their comrades in the Sudan. (Cheers.) . . . . As to their Eastern Empire, all praise was due to Lord Elgin for having successfully grappled with the three great evils of plague, war, and famine. (Cheers.) But those visitations had made their mark, and never was there greater need for that touch of sympathy to which the people of India so readily responded. The magnificent reception given to Lord Curzon was largely due to the fact that India knew that he was in sympathy with her troubles, her genius, and her legitimate aspirations. (Hear, hear.)

THE ARMY QUESTION IN THE SUDAN.
THE CURRENCY COMMITTEE.

Lord Kimberley, in the course of his speech, said:—The assumption of so huge a territory as the Sudan is involves a responsibility of a very peculiar and serious nature, especially with regard to the troops by which that territory must be occupied. I have admired the conduct as much as anyone of the Egyptian and Sudanese troops; I do not for a moment question their fidelity to us and the Khedive; but it will be vain to shut our eyes to this—that there are dangers inseparable from the occupation of a vast territory inhabited by people of the Mahometan faith and by troops which are themselves Mahometan. That is exemplified most strikingly by our position in India. We know that it is a settled principle in India that you shall not have less than one-third of your army there composed of British white troops, and the rest of Natives. It seems to me impossible to believe that we can be in a permanent position of safety in the Sudan—which I now assume to mean the whole of the Sudan which was subject to the Khalifa—I do not believe you can possibly have permanent security in that country unless you are able to have at your call a body of white troops sufficient, in case any disaffection should arise among native troops, to control them. Now I am quite aware that the construction of the railway will make it comparatively easy to send white troops to the Sudan from Egypt. But I do not know that that would always be sufficient; but still it is a very important consideration. I also do not leave out of sight the fact that the Egyptian troops are not the same body of men as the Sudanese troops; and therein lies a certain amount of security. But I wish to point out this further—that if you are to send from time to time a sufficient body of white troops to the Sudan, that means the keeping larger forces permanently in Egypt. (Hear, hear.) I think none of your lordships can be insensible of the facts, first, that our army to perform the duties which it has always had to perform is by no means a large one, and secondly, it is extremely doubtful whether, without having recourse to measures which none of us would desire to have recourse to, you could obtain recruits for the army to serve in such climates as the Sudan and India to any considerable extent. Your lordships who have had to do either with the War Office or the India Office know well the extreme difficulty there always has been of finding men of sufficiently mature age to go to India, and if you have in addition to them to find men of mature age also for additional regiments for the African Empire, I think it will be putting our forces to a very serious strain. Now this is not a question of the moment, it is a question of the future; and in making these remarks I have in my mind the striking peroration of the speech which the noble marquis made on a similar occasion last year, in which he eloquently pointed out that great as is our power, we may place burdens upon the Empire difficult for it to bear. And, therefore, though it may seem an ungrateful task—and I know it is an ungrateful task—in the moment of victory such as we have achieved in the Sudan to appear in any sense what might be called a prophet of evil, I think it is the absolute duty of every man who takes part in public affairs to clearly place before the country the other side of the case, for this reason—that our nation in the lust of victory might be easily led to overlook the other side of the picture, and not sufficiently to consider what the ultimate difficulties and dangers may be which we may have to face. When we have to face them I believe we will face them bravely and successfully; but still, when you are expanding the Empire, I think I am justified in uttering that warning. . . . . I will say one word upon India, both on account of the mention of it in the Queen's Speech and also because of the presence of Lord Elgin. (Cheers.) It must be very gratifying to him that on both sides of the House there is a strong sense of the admirable services he has rendered to the Empire in circumstances of peculiar difficulty which might have tried any statesmen in any department of public life. (Cheers.) We have to congratulate ourselves upon the present condition of India, except for the prevalence of the unfortunate plague, and above all we may congratulate ourselves for the first time on the prospects of relief from financial difficulty. I hear that they are likely to have a very large and substantial surplus, and I trust therefore it will be felt that some of the changes which have been made in the law of currency, which we were justified in making, have saved India from a serious financial crisis. I shall welcome the report of the Committee on Indian Currency. I hope that the result will be to settle that most difficult matter upon a permanent, lasting basis.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Sanitary Measures),—Copy of Report on Sanitary Measures in India in 1896-7, Volume XXX (*during the Recess*);

East India (Trade),—Copy of Review and Tables relating to the Trade of British India with British Possessions and Foreign Countries for the five years 1893-4 to 1897-8 (*during the Recess*).

East India (Loans raised in England),—Copy presented—of Return of all Loans raised in England, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ending on September 30, 1898, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Loans raised in India),—Copy presented—of Return of all Loans raised in India, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ending on September 30, 1898, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.
THE PROMISED "SURPLUS."

Captain Bagot, moving the Address in reply, said in the course of

his speech, that if the paragraph in the Speech dealing with India gave cause for regret that the plague still existed in that country, it was satisfactory to learn that the disease was of a less virulent type and that the Native population had come to a better understanding with those engaged in combating the disease. (Hear, hear.) The announcement that India had made a most remarkable recovery since the famine of 1897 was very satisfactory. The Indian Treasury, in spite of the deficits of the last two years, would be able to show at the end of the financial year a surplus of something like two and three-quarter millions. (Hear, hear.)

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN said that reference was made in the Queen's speech to measures for checking the plague in India and relieving the sufferers. He fully recognised the efforts made by the authorities in fighting the disease, but he would like them to make full enquiry into the causes which made the people such easy victims. (Hear, hear.) He believed it was because they were so poor and ill-nourished, and because sufficient money was not spent in sanitation. It was the same as regards the famine. A Famine Commission had been appointed, and he had hoped they would go into the causes from which the people were so poor as to be unable to resist the effects of even one failure of harvest. The Secretary of State had led them to expect that the scope of the enquiry would have been wider, but the Commission seemed practically to have restricted itself to discussing the machinery for famine relief, regarding which no special complaint was made. After these years of suffering from war, pestilence, and famine, he was disappointed that the speech did not contain some kindly words of sympathy and encouragement to the people of India, with a statement of the measures intended to help them back to prosperity and contentment. It was stated that the revenue was recovering and that there would be a large surplus this year, about 2¾ millions. He hoped this would be used to relieve the taxation, such as the salt-tax, which pressed on the indigent masses. He had read with pleasure the speeches made by the new Viceroy, expressing his sympathy for the people and his determination to learn for himself the facts regarding their condition. He had before him a great opportunity for a successful career. But in order to gain success he must gain the confidence and obtain the co-operation of the people. For this purpose it was necessary to abandon the retrograde policy recently adopted, and return to the good old methods. They talked of disaffection in India. The cure for disaffection was to create affection, and that would not be done by withdrawing the concessions and privileges enjoyed during the last sixty years. There was the case of the Natus, imprisoned without trial, and without any intelligible cause. Even now they were not quite free. Let them be absolutely released, and it would much promote good feeling. Again there were the Sedition laws and the Press Committees. Instead of charges of sedition being tried with jury or assessors they were now tried by the District Magistrate, himself the head of the police, whose position would make him morbidly sensitive to outside criticism. Then there was since 1896 a retrograde policy as regards the education department, graduates of the highest distinction at Oxford and Cambridge being excluded from the principalships of the Bengal colleges on the sole ground of being Indians. That was not in accordance with the principles of her Majesty's Gracious Proclamation of 1858. Again attacks were being made on municipal government in Calcutta, although the municipality had successfully resisted the inroads of the plague, and had a record of 22 years of good work, stamped with official approval. This matter would be dealt with more particularly in an amendment to be brought on later. Nothing could be more disastrous than attempts to put back the hands of the clock in India. On this point he would quote Sir Douglas Straight, late a High Court Judge in India, and well known to hon. gentlemen opposite. Writing to the *Times* regarding his experiences in India he says he is "firmly convinced of one thing and it is this—that while innovations and changes there should only be very gradually and cautiously introduced, a concession once made should never be withdrawn except for reasons of the most paramount and pressing emergency." At present the reasons were all in favour of conciliation and more encouragement to the people, and he trusted that under the new Viceroy there would be a new era marked by domestic reform, educational progress, and industrial development. (Cheers.)

Thursday, February 9.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

Brajo nath Ghôsh,—Petition from Sarangabad Thana, for enquiry into his case. To lie upon the Table.

Tirumalayachari,—Petition from Nallurkadoo, for enquiry into his case. To lie upon the Table.

East India (Law of Sedition),—Petition from Manchuri, against recent alteration. To lie upon the Table.

THE MOVEMENT TOWARDS TIBET.
SUGGESTED ONLY BY "IRRESPONSIBLE PERSONS."

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that public attention in India had lately been directed to various suggestions for a forward movement in the direction of Tibet; And whether he would undertake that, in the event of such a movement being made beyond the Indian frontiers, no expense in connexion with it should be imposed upon the taxpayers of India.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I understand that some suggestions of the kind indicated in the hon. member's question have been made by irresponsible persons; but as nothing of the sort has come under my consideration I am unable to say anything further on the subject.

INDIAN TROOPS BEYOND THE FRONTIERS.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether a return could be presented at an early date of Indian Government troops employed outside of India, in Africa, and beyond the North-West frontier of her Majesty's Indian possessions, together with copies of correspondence that had passed on this subject between the Indian Government and the India Office.

Lord G. HAMILTON: On August 4 last, in reply to a question from the hon. member for West Denbighshire, I stated that the only Indian forces now employed in Africa or elsewhere beyond seas were as follows: In Africa, the 27th Bombay Infantry, and a wing of the 4th Bombay Infantry. In Mauritius, the 1st Bengal Infantry. As regards these troops, the only change that has taken place since then is that the wing of the 4th Bombay Infantry has returned to India.

I also stated that I was not prepared to give a return in detail as to the strength of the forces employed on the North-West frontier in India; nor do I now think it expedient to do so, or to publish the correspondence which has passed on these subjects.

THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL BILL.

The following Notice of Motion appears in the Order book of the House of Commons:—

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS,—As an Amendment to the Address, at end, add:—Humbly to assure your Majesty that this House regards with grave concern the introduction of the Calcutta Municipal Bill, now under consideration by the Bengal Legislative Council, which, if enacted, will practically destroy the representative character of the Calcutta municipality, and will constitute a retrograde step in the system of local government in India, and prays that your Majesty will graciously direct that the further consideration of the Bill be postponed until a duly constituted Commission has taken evidence and has reported upon the objections urged against the Bill by the ratepayers of Calcutta.

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Elsewhere in the present issue of INDIA will be found a report of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's address to the North Islington Liberal and Radical Association on Monday last.

As has already been announced, Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., has consented to address a meeting of the "Liberal Forwards" on February 28, on "India in Parliament."

On January 30 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee lectured at the Liberal Club, Wigan, on "English rule in India." The chairman of the Liberal Association, Mr. Laycock, presided, and there was a large attendance. Votes of thanks to the lecturer and chairman concluded a very interesting meeting.

Speaking on "Current Politics" at Milnrow, on February 1, a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee dealt largely with Indian affairs. There was a crowded audience.

On February 2 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee gave a lantern lecture on India in the lecture hall of the Accrington Liberal Club. Alderman Broughton presided over a large audience.

At the Temperance Hall, Skipton, a public meeting was held on February 3 to hear an address by a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee on "Some Liberal Reforms for India." Mr. A. Gonney presided, and referred to the meeting of the Indian National Congress at Madras. The resolutions passed at that Congress were, he said, moderate in tone and reasonable in demand; and he could see no reason why the English people should deny the reforms specified.

The following meetings have been arranged for this week:—

February 6.—Wibsey Liberal Club.
,, 7.—Bradford. Public meeting at the Mechanics' Institute.
,, 9.—East Bradford Liberal Club.
,, 10.—Cowling.
,, 11.—Sowerby Bridge.

Reprints of Mr. N. N. Ghose's able pamphlet upon the Calcutta Municipal Bill are being distributed in large quantities at public meetings held in connexion with the British Committee of the Indian National Congress.

JUST PUBLISHED.

With Maps, Plans, Portraits, and Illustrations, 8vo, 8/6 net.

THE CAMPAIGN IN TIRAH 1897-98.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE EXPEDITION AGAINST THE ORAKZAIS AND AFRIDIS UNDER GENERAL SIR WILLIAM LOCKHART, G.C.B., K.C.S.I.

Based (by permission) on Letters contributed to the TIMES,

By COLONEL H. D. HUTCHINSON,

Director of Military Education in India.

DAILY CHRONICLE.—"We are not sure that his very carefully compiled and very well written work will not ultimately rank as the best account of this our finest instance of mountain warfare. . . . . Must be a real pleasure to all students of military history."

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED, LONDON.

BOURNEMOUTH: Invalids and others RETURNING FROM INDIA may find comfortable Lodgings and Attendance (with good cooking) at "Debonnaire," Boscombe. References kindly permitted, amongst others, to Sir F. R. Maunsell, R.E., E. I. Service Club; and to Colonel J. W. Fleming Sandwith, Guildford. Address, Mr. D. F. de Souza, 31, Knole Road, Bournemouth, East.

NOW READY.

Price One Shilling and Sixpence, net. In India, 1 Rupee.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 2.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

EVIDENCE-IN-CHIEF OF THE FIVE INDIAN WITNESSES.

Large foolscap, 116 pp.

Published by the
BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

This Volume may be also obtained from the Secretaries of the Standing Congress Committees at Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras. Remittances should accompany application.

N.B.—The postage of each copy is 4d., in addition to the price stated above.

JUST PUBLISHED. Crown 8vo, 5s.

RÂMAKRISHNA: HIS LIFE AND SAYINGS.

BY THE RIGHT HON. F. MAX MÜLLER, K.M.,
Foreign Member of the French Institute; Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford.

⁂ *Râmakrishna, whose life is described and whose sayings have been collected in this volume, was one of those Indian ascetics and sages who are known under different names, as Sannyâsins, Mahâtmans, or Yogins. He was born in 1833, and died in 1886.*

LONDON: LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS: ITS AIMS AND JUSTIFICATION.

[Being a reprint of certain articles on the subject in the *Statesman and Friend of India.*]

BY ROBERT KNIGHT.

CALCUTTA: Published at the *Statesman* Office.

The above will be sent to any address on receipt of 1d. stamp for postage. Application should be made to the Manager of "INDIA," 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

TOOTH-ACHE

CURED INSTANTLY BY

BUNTER'S Prevents Decay, Saves Extraction. Sleepless Nights Prevented.

Neuralgic Headaches and all Nerve Pains removed by BUNTER'S NERVINE. All Chemists, 1s. 1½d. **NERVINE**

---

is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER know
C. E. WOOD, apt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

**THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.**

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.